

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:
D. BENJAMIN BORSON
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
FOURTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4156

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference NRNZ01052WO0		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 24 FEB 2005 FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No.	International filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/US04/35165	22 October 2004 (22.10.2004)	23 October 2003 (23.10.2003)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
IPC(7): A61K 38/00 and US Cl.: 514/18		
Applicant		
NEUREN PHARMACEUTICALS LTD.		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application


2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer  Maury Audet Telephone No. 571-272-0960
--	--

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

Best Available Copy

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/US04/35165

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

☐ a sequence listing

☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

☐ in written format

☐ in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

☐ contained in international application as filed.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

Best Available Copy

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/US04/35165

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

1. The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application
- ☒ claims Nos. Claims 11-13, 17-20, 22-24, and 28

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claim Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

- ☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 11-13, 17-20, 22-24 and 28 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

Under PCT Rule 6.4(a), these claims constitute improper multiple dependent claims.

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

- ☐ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. _____

- ☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

☐

has not been furnished

☐

does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

☐

has not been furnished

☐

does not comply with the standard

- ☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

- ☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.
PCT/US04/35165

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-10,14-16,21 and 25-27</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-10,14-16,21 and 25-27</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-16,21 and 25-27</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-10, 14-16, 21, and 25-27 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2), as drawn a method of protecting/providing prolonged protection to neural cells in response to a neuronal insult, decreasing neural cell death or degeneration following a neuronal insult resulting from hypoxia/ischemia caused by elective surgery/stroke using the tripeptide gly-pro-glu (GPE) or GPE with at least one protease or peptidase inhibitor (i.e. pepstatin-A). Either Alexi (claims 20-21, para. 0011 and 0018) or Gluckman et al. (para. 0010 and 0028) teach various methods of treating neuronal cells using use of GPE and/or GPE prodrugs with i.e. pepstatin-A.

Claims 1-10, 14-16, 21, and 25-27 also lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3), as drawn a method of protecting/providing prolonged protection to neural cells in response to a neuronal insult, decreasing neural cell death or degeneration following a neuronal insult resulting from hypoxia/ischemia caused by elective surgery/stroke using the tripeptide gly-pro-glu (GPE) or GPE with at least one protease or peptidase inhibitor (i.e. pepstatin-A); based on above teachings.

Claims 1-10, 14-16, 21, and 25-27 have industrial applicability under PCT Article 33(4) since GPE may be used to treat neuronal cells.

Best Available Copy